

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 22, 23, and 25 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 22, 23, and 25 have been rejected.

Claim 3 has been canceled.

Claims 1, 9, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed Application and, at least, within paragraphs [0019] and [0030].

Examiner Interview

Applicants express thanks for the interview conducted on January 6, 2010 between Examiner Shih and Applicants' counsel. During the interview, amendments to the claims were discussed with the aim of further distinguishing the claims from the cited references. The Examiner agreed that amended language such as that provided in the present limitations would serve to distinguish the claims from the cited references.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 22-23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,346,843 ("Hind"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0128618 ("Datta"), and U.S. Patent 7,168,045 ("Fliess"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 23, as amended, include limitations directed toward the display of user-specific information that is pre-selected by a manager of the user, where the user has requested a display of realtime and non-realtime information.

As discussed during the Examiner interview, the cited sections of Fliess fail to provide disclosure of pre-selected user-specific information by a manager. *See, e.g.*, Fliess 5:55-60. Instead, Fliess suggests that a view may be based on a user's role. *See id.* While, in Fliess, a user's role may be defined by a manager of the user, the user's role only determines a "type" of access provided to the user. Fliess merely restricts access to a user based on the user's role. For example, the user interface functions visible to a user in Fliess may be restricted based on the user's role. *See* Fliess 5:61-63. This restricted access in Fliess does not apply to the amended claims because no such restriction is made in the amended claims.

The amended claim limitations provide for a display of "user-specific information" that is pre-selected by a user's manager, along with the claimed realtime and non-realtime information. In this manner, a manager can select information that the manager believes to be important for the user to see in addition to what the user requested. Fliess does not contemplate display of such user-specific information because Fliess does not contemplate that the user will be presented with any information that the user did not request. As indicated above, Fliess merely provides for restricting a user's access to information.

Thus, it cannot be said that Fliess teaches or contemplates all the elements of the claimed "user-specific information." Further, neither Hind nor Datta is cited as teaching or suggesting a similar limitation, and was not provided by the Examiner during the Examiner interview as providing such a limitation. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hind nor Datta nor Fliess, nor any combination of these references, teach or contemplate the newly claimed "user-specific information."

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that neither Fliess nor Hind nor Datta, alone or in combination, provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent claims 1, 5, 8, 19, 23, 26, and 28, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the application and the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan N. Geld/

Jonathan N. Geld
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,702
Telephone: (512) 439-5090
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099